DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 869 CE 034 431

AUTHOR Hougland, James G., Jr.; And Others
TITLE The Impact of Job Training on Occupational Mobility: The Experiences of Former CETA Participants.
INSTITUTION Kentucky Univ., Lexington.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, CA, September 6-10, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Adults; *Employment Level; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Job Training; *Occupational Mobility; On the Job Training; Program Effectiveness; Vocational Education; *Wages; Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Impact

ABSTRACT

Changes in occupational status and income were examined among former participants in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs that had an educational focus and the purpose of providing short-term employment. Telephone interviews were conducted with 62 percent of individuals who terminated from CETA programs in a selected state during the third quarter of FY1981. Data, primarily demographic, were also obtained from agency data systems. CETA participation appeared to lead to marked decreases in unemployment and to modest economic gains. The socioeconomic status of former participants' occupations did not appear to be affected by CETA participation, but some movement into the "primary" or "core" industrial sectors did occur. These positive results were likely to be associated with work experience and on-the-job training programs. Formal education and prior occupational history were shown to be rather unimportant influences either before or after CETA program participation. (A bibliography, six tables, and two figures are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223869

The Impact of Job Training on Occupational Mobility: The Experiences of Former CETA Participants*

James G. Hougland, Jr.

James A. Christenson

University of Kentucky

David S. Walls

Sonoma State University

CE034431

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J G Hougland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*This paper is based on research conducted under the auspices of the Appalachian Center, Center for Developmental Change, and Survey Research Center of the University of Kentucky. While the authors are solely responsible for the content of this paper, we wish to acknowledge the valuable professional assistance provided by David B. Rymph, Pat Ray Reese, and Phillip M. Monk during various stages of the research.

The Impact of Job Training on Occupational Mobility:
The Experiences of Former CETA Participants

ABSTRACT

Students of occupational mobility have long been interested in the effects of education on occupational status and income. Considered in combination, the studies suggest that, while obtaining a college degree enhances one's occupational status, education below the college level has little impact beyond that which would be predicted from one's socioeconomic background. However, generalizations about the effects of pre-college education are seldom based on a consideration of job training programs such as those sponsored by CETA. While the effects of CETA programs inevitably reflect the economic and social structure of the larger society and the trainee's community, their specific emphasis on technical training and job placement and retention suggests that they have a potential to exert stronger positive effects on income and occupational status than traditional secondary educational programs.

The present study examines changes in occupational status and income among former participants in adult CETA programs. Programs with an educational (training) focus and those designed primarily to provide short-term employment are considered. Major questions addressed are: (1) does CETA participation produce appreciable changes in income or occupational status; (2) does CETA participation diminish the influences of family background and prior educational attainment on income or occupational status; (3) does CETA participation lead to appreciable mobility between primary and secondary industrial sectors; and (4) do the effects of CETA participation vary between types of CETA program activities?

The Impact of Job Training on Occupational Mobility: The Experiences of Former CETA Participants

Students of occupational mobility have long been interested in the effects of education on occupational status and income. Basing their work on neo-classical economic theory, human capital theorists (e.g., Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1974) view wages and job characteristics as outcomes of individuals' investments in education training, and experience. Theorists of status attainment (e.g., Blau and Duncan; 1967; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Hauser and Featherman, 1977; Jencks, 1979; Sewell and Hauser, 1975) are somewhat more likely to consider barriers to maximal occupational attainment. Parents' education and occupational background, in particular, are viewed as factors which may expedite or inhibit occupational attainment. However, status attainment theorists join human capital theorists in emphasizing the influences of an individual's own education and prior labor market experience on his or her current income and occupation.

The human capital and status attainment perspectives are supported by considerable evidence, but they have been criticized for their underlying assumption that labor markets are homogeneous. As Cain (1976) has noted, critics have emphasized differences between primary and secondary jobs as well as internal and external labor markets (Doeringer and Piore, 1971; Kerr, 1954).

The present study focuses on the occupational experiences of predominantly unskilled and disadvantaged workers. The sample includes many individuals who are likely to have experienced the kinds of barriers to mobility noted by

critics of the human capital and status attainment traditions. For this reason, one of the major questions to be addressed in this paper concerns the extent to which educational attainment and prior occupational history — variables which have been shown to be important in prior status attainment research — affect current occupation and income. While most status attainment studies are based on samples containing some economically disadvantaged individuals, they are usually too few in number for a detailed understanding of their experiences to be gained.

Everyone in our sample is a former CETA participant, including some who participated in CETA programs with an educational or training emphasis and others who participated in programs designed primarily to provide short-term employment. We are therefore in a position to ask several additional questions which will lead to a clarification of the impacts of educational and training experiences on relatively disadvantaged workers. Major questions addressed are: (1) does CETA participation produce appreciable changes in income or occupational status; (2) does CETA participation diminish the influences of family background and prior educational attainment on income or occupational status; (3) does CETA participation lead to appreciable mobility between primary and secondary industrial sectors; and (4) do the effects of CETA participation vary between types of CETA program activities? Answers to these questions will provide the basis for an evaluation of the effectiveness of job training and other CETA programs in integrating disadvantaged workers into the industrial workforce.

SOME RELATED LITERATURE

The Effects of Education and Training

The existing literature provides support for the contention that education

increases income and occupational status (e.g., Eckaus, 1973; Featherman and Hauser, 1978), but some qualifications must be noted. Berg (1970) contends that, while education is related to higher income, an increasingly large number of people occupy jobs which fail to utilize their educational background. Such findings suggest that while education is used as a symbolic screening device, the specific content of educational and training programs may have little if any impact on occupational experience.

Findings reported by Jencks and associates (1979) suggest a similar conclusion. They found that, while college education (particularly getting a B.A.) had a significant effect on occupation and earnings, obtaining a high school degree had a less important effect. Moreover, the effects of a high school degree failed to survive controls for related variables. College, on the other hand, exerted effects which could not be explained by family background and cognitive skill. In attempting to interpret these findings, Jencks and associates concluded that employers were "overrewarding" individuals with B.A.'s because they needed an arbitrary device for distributing jobs (1979: 166, 184). It appears that many employers respond to formal credentials rather than the content of the educational experience. Such an interpretation creates doubts about the ability of CETA programs to promote upward mobility because CETA programs are unlikely to lead to formal credentials which are accorded high prestige.

Studies based on the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS) have shown that, while CETA programs do not immediately produce large increases in income, income does steadily increase over time for former CETA participants (WESTAT, 1981: 6-29). These findings, considered alone, suggest that, while CETA does not provide credentials leading to immediate success, it does provide the basis for a steady improvement in former participants' economic situation.

However, these relatively encouraging findings should be balanced against the fact that some categories of former participants actually experienced declines

in annual earnings. It is particularly important to note that those who had earned more than $8,000 before entering CETA earned about $1,190 less after leaving CETA (WESTAT, 1981: 6-14). While some individuals who appear to have left the labor force altogether depressed the average for this category, it appears that CETA's success in providing credentials conducive to high levels of employment and income may be limited.

Theories of Segmented Labor Markets

While the human capital/status attainment literature suggests several useful insights about determinants of labor market experience, an increasing number of theorists and researchers have suggested that an adequate understanding of labor market experiences requires one to drop assumptions that there exists only one labor market operating on the basis of pure competition between actors with differential "human capital" investments (e.g., Gordon, 1972; Kalleberg and Sorensen, 1979; Leigh, 1978; Osterman, 1975). Doeringer and Piore (1971), in particular, have argued for the existence of two basic labor markets, a primary sector and a secondary sector. In the secondary sector, consisting mainly of unskilled, semiskilled, and service workers, jobs involve low pay, poor working conditions, and little chance of advancement. Moreover, a highly personalized relationship exists between workers and supervisors. This "leaves wide latitude for favoritism and is conducive to harsh and capricious work discipline" (Piore, 1975:126).

The literature suggests that jobs within secondary labor markets are characterized by high turnover and job training which is simple and brief. Because of such characteristics, orderly careers are unlikely to develop:

> Without job ladders or opportunity to develop skill or knowledge, there is no inherent potential for orderly movement into other jobs even if some co-

workers leave the market and enter others (Althauser and Kalleberg, 1981:136).

Theories of segmented labor markets suggest that job training programs and other programs directed toward low-skill workers must be evaluated on the basis of the kinds of jobs in which workers are placed. Piore (1970) has criticized job training programs on these grounds, suggesting that most of their participants remain confined to the secondary labor market.

Overview

Theorists and researchers emphasizing human capital and status attainment have highlighted the importance of individuals' characteristics and prior achievements for understanding their current experiences in the labor market. These formulations suggest that parental background, demographic characteristics, and education and training are among the variables which should be incorporated in explanatory models. However, they have been criticized for their assumption of a single labor market allowing pure competition between potential jobholders.

Segmented labor market theorists highlight the importance of examining characteristics of the jobs and industrial sectors in which individuals are placed. Our data on former CETA participants will allow an examination of the usefulness of both perspectives for understanding the experiences of predominantly low-skilled workers within industrial society.

Miller and Form (1980:618) note:

> Economic inequality has many important consequences especially in industrial societies ... Because we are concerned with industrial societies in which markets are the main distributional mechanisms, most of the things which are socially and culturally valued are obtainable with money. Highly developed societies, by their very nature, are

> "materialistic" societies in the sense that the acquisition of almost any end (even nonmaterial) becomes cost and price conditioned. Unless the accumulation of money and property is limited by strong social and/or governmental sanctions, industrial societies also tend to develop gross economic inequalities.

An examination of the success of training and work experience programs in promoting mobility for otherwise disadvantaged individuals is therefore an important task within industrial sociology.

METHODS

Source of Data

Individuals who terminated from CETA programs in a selected state during the third quarter (April-June) of the 1981 fiscal year were contacted for telephone interviews. Attempts were made to find all such individuals rather than a random sample because the population could not be defined until interviewing was well under way.

Because some respondents were difficult to locate, several tracking procedures were used. These included the use of directory assistance, requests for information from the local office of the state agency with which the person had registered for services and the last known employer, and the mailing of letters to the last known address (address correction requested) with instructions to call us collect. Additional procedures were used on an individual basis. Even with these procedures, about 24 percent of the potential respondents could not be contacted. Fortunately, 81.1 percent of those with whom some kind of contact was established were successfully interviewed. The

overall response rate was 62.0 percent when those with whom no contact was made are included in the calculations.

Followup interviews with the same individuals were conducted during the spring of 1982. The followup interviews (as well as interviews with some additional respondent groups) will provide information on respondents' experiences for the ten to twelve month interval following termination from CETA. The present paper presents tentative conclusions based on the first round of interviews.

Measurement of Variables

Data were obtained from agency data systems as well as telephone interviews. Agency systems were useful primarily for demographic data. Most variables used in this paper were based on information provided by respondents during the interviews.

Occupation, which is a variable of central importance for this study, has been found by many researchers to be difficult to measure. However, Hauser and Featherman (1977:61) have shown that carefully phrased questions can elicit useful data on occupations. In consultation with individuals responsible for occupational coding for the state agency which contracted for this research, we expanded upon Hauser and Featherman's suggestions to develop the following series of questions (with tense modified as appropriate) for current job, other jobs held following CETA, and the last three jobs held before CETA:

> What is your current job title?
>
> What do you actually do?
>
> What machinery or equipment do you use to help you do your job?
>
> What kinds of materials do you work with?
>
> What is the purpose or final product of your job?

What kind of business or industry is this?

(Asked only if not obvious):
Are you employed by a private company, business, or individual; a government agency; or are you self-employed in your own business or firm?

We found that, when interviewers were trained in probing techniques, these questions were quite workable. The series of questions tended to be time-consuming, but many respondents provided enough information in early answers that some questions did not have to be explicitly asked.

The questions allowed us to establish codes for jobs in terms of Census definitions (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971), the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Employment and Training Administration, 1977), and Standard Industrial Classifications (Office of Management and Budget, 1972). Early efforts by all coders were verified by an individual who is responsible for occupational coding as part of his work for a state agency. After a coder's systematic errors had been corrected, samples of his or her work continued to be subject to verification.

In this paper, we rely primarily on census occupation codes and Standard Industrial Classifications. The former are recoded into an updated version of Duncan's Socioeconomic Index (SEI) developed by Stevens and Featherman (1981). Detailed analysis by Hauser and Featherman (1977:16-50) shows that SEI codes provide the best available indication of an occupation's standing within the social stratification structure. (For a more critical discussion of the SEI, see Hodge, 1981. Despite his reservations, Hodge does not appear to dispute the empirical usefulness of SEI codes.) The latter are recoded into "core" (or primary) and "periphery" (or secondary) industrial sectors as developed by Hodson (1978). While several alternative categorizations of industries into sectors

have been suggested, Wallace and Kalleberg (1981) found in a comparative analysis that Hodson's measure most nearly reflects major economic organization variables. The classification receives partial validation from a comparison of wage levels for respondents employed in the two sectors. The median wage level for respondents in the "periphery" was $3.50 per hour, while those in the "core" received a median wage of $4.00 per hour. When analysis is confined to those in the private sector, median wage levels are $3.50 for the "periphery" and $4.30 for the "core".

FINDINGS

Changes in Wage Levels and Socioeconomic Status of Occupations

Respondents who were employed both before CETA and at the time of the interview experienced an increase in median hourly wage from $3.45 to $3.63 per hour. In interpreting this change, it should be noted that the federally defined minimum wage increased by 25 cents while many of the respondents were in CETA. Since respondents vary in the number of hours worked per week, average weekly wages are also considered. Their importance stems from their reflection of individuals' success in securing full-time employment (which is associated with the likelihood of fringe benefits) as well as high hourly wage levels. The median weekly wage increased by $7.20, from $137.60 to $144.80.

While such statistics are important, they are somewhat misleading because they fail to account for the actual increase in earned income. They are based only on respondents who were employed both before and after CETA, an important limitation because the median proportion of the period between the completion of CETA and the administration of the interview in which respondents were unemployed was .09. The corresponding proportion for the

year before CETA was .54. The above statistics were therefore recalculated with income set to zero for respondents at the times they were unemployed.[1] Using this calculation, median wage levels increased $32.80 per week, from $101.20 to $134.00.

Changes in the socioeconomic status of occupations were virtually non-existent. Mean SEI scores[2] increased from 23.48 to 23.94, while median scores dropped slightly, from 20.95 to 20.71. The findings suggest that CETA participation is more likely to affect the economic aspects of work (most especially the ability to find a job) than the social standing of work activities.

The Prediction of Pre- and Post-CETA Income and Occupational Standing

Variables traditionally used in status attainment research (e.g., Blau and Duncan, 1967) allow an exploration of the extent to which CETA programs diminish participants' degree of dependence on family origins for economic and occupational success. Figure 1 summarizes the results of regression analyses in which father's occupation (SEI), father's education, and respondent's education are used as predictors of wage and SEI levels before and after CETA. If wage levels increased after CETA (as they did to some extent), and if SEI levels increased (as they did not), and if both variables were shown to be less closely related to family background and earlier experiences (e.g., education) after CETA than before, then CETA programs could be said to have led to freedom from participants' former backgrounds. Figure 1 shows that this is not the case. The predictor variables are not closely related to income or SEI either before or after CETA. If anything, their predictive usefulness tends to increase after CETA.

One possible source of error in the equations summarized in Figure 1 is the inclusion of a variety of demographic categories. The analysis was therefore repeated for more homogeneous categories of respondents. Figure

2 summarizes the results of one such attempt, presenting equations for white males. As the figure shows, confining the analysis to relatively homogeneous categories made little difference. It would appear that the opportunities faced by individuals who are attracted to CETA programs are so limited that their social characteristics have little impact on their occupational experiences.

The Relationship of CETA to Industrial Sectors

While the economic and social impacts of CETA described so far have (with the exception of reduction in unemployment) been rather modest, the possibility exists that former participants have been exposed to opportunities which will allow continued improvement. Movement from the secondary industrial sector (the periphery) to the primary industrial sector (the core) could provide some evidence that such a possibility exists. Some movement has, in fact, occurred. The proportion of respondents in the core sector increased from 36.5 percent before CETA to 45.1 percent after CETA.

While these findings are generally encouraging, it should be noted that many government jobs are classified as "core" because they have traditionally offered reasonable security and opportunities for promotion. Since CETA is sometimes evaluated in terms of placement in the private sector, the analysis was repeated for the private sector only. When government jobs were removed from the analysis, the apparent impact of CETA on employment in the core sector was more modest. Before CETA, 33.1 percent of private-sector employees were employed in core industries. After CETA, the corresponding percentage was 36.5.

Results by Program Activity

While the analysis so far indicates that CETA is associated with appreciable reductions in unemployment and some rather modest changes in income in the industrial sector, it should be recognized that CETA actually involves a number of different programs. Dramatic positive changes associated with one program activity may be masked by inconsequential changes or strong negative changes associated with another activity. We therefore examined changes associated with five major program activities--Work Experience (WE), On-the-Job Training (OJT), Classroom Training in Occupational Skills (CT), Public Service Employment (PSE), and Employment and Training Services (ETS).[5] WE involves subsidized employment experiences intended primarily for low-skilled workers; OJT provides clients with experiential training in actual work settings while providing employers with partial reimbursement for training costs; CT involves vocational training in a formal educational setting; PSE (no longer in existence) paid clients to work for local government or community agencies; and ETS involves short-term training in how to find a job. Except for PSE, the above programs represent activities which are likely to be included in some combination in any "package" of job-training programs.

Tables 1 through 6 summarize the economic outcomes of CETA participation by primary program.[6] Considered in combination, the tables show that WE is associated with considerable improvement in the economic situations of former participants. However, WE clients are sufficiently disadvantaged that they are seldom able to reach the economic levels of participants in such programs as OJT. ETS is shown to be the other program which is used for seriously disadvantaged individuals, but it generally leads to little

improvement. OJT programs are used for individuals who, when contrasted with WE participants, appear to enjoy some advantages before entering CETA. However, it is generally associated with some additional improvement in economic situation. CT programs lead to some economic improvements, but they do not appear to promote movement into the "core" industrial sector (Tables 5 and 6). Improvements associated with the now defunct PSE programs are generally quite modest.

Analyzing results by program shows that overall averages tend to mask the success of WE and OJT programs in reducing unemployment (Table 1), of WE and CT programs in raising wage levels (Tables 2 and 3), and of WE, OJT, and (if government jobs are included) PSE programs in moving workers into the core industrial sector (Tables 5 and 6). However, earlier conclusions about the virtually nonexistent impact of CETA on the social standing of occupations continue to hold (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

In interpreting the findings of this report, it should be recalled that interviews were conducted within a few months after individuals had finished their CETA programs. Follow-up interviews are currently in progress, and the results of those interviews could alter many of the conclusions suggested by the present analysis. It will be particularly important to examine the extent to which the generally modest gains documented in this paper are sustained over a longer period of time. CLMS analysis indicates that steady increases in income are a distinct possibility (WESTAT, 1981).

While CETA participation does not lead to the prestigious formal credentials associated with some kinds of educational and training experiences, it does appear to lead to marked decreases in unemployment and modest economic gains. The socioeconomic status of former participants'

occupations does not appear to be affected by CETA participation, but some movement into the "primary" or "core" industrial sector does occur. Such positive outcomes are particularly likely to be associated with Work Experience (WE) and On-the-Job Training (OJT) programs. This finding is important because WE programs are used primarily for individuals who have experienced particularly severe economic deprivation, while OJT is used for individuals who are less severely disadvantaged. The potential for positive outcomes does not appear to be confined to either category.

One of the major questions left unanswered by this research is the question of precisely what kinds of factors influence occupation and income among the former CETA participants examined in this study. Formal education and prior occupational history--variables which have been shown to be important in prior status attainment research--have been shown to be rather unimportant influences either before or after CETA. It is possible that the CETA experience itself sets the stage for integrating disadvantaged workers into the industrial workplace. Analysis of follow-up interviews will allow a more detailed exploration of this possibility.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Income was set equal to zero for the year before CETA only if the respondent was unemployed for the entire year. Otherwise, income for the last job held during the year was used. Income was set to zero for the "after CETA" period if the respondent was unemployed at the time of the interview.

[2] SEI scores have been calculated for the total population and for males. "Total" SEI scores are reported here. Calculations using "male" SEI scores led to similar conclusions.

[3] Very small coefficients were allowed to remain in the equations because we were interested in showing the effects (or lack thereof) of the predictor variables rather than developing the most efficient possible equations.

[4] Hodson originally separated government jobs from others in the "core" industrial sector, but Wallace and Kalleberg have argued that the two can reasonably be combined.

[5] Some individuals were involved in more than one CETA program activity. We classified them on the basis of the program in which they had spent the greatest amount of time. The General Equivalency Degree (GED) program was also available to CETA participants. It is not reported here because it was the primary program for very few respondents.

[6] Tests of statistical significance are not reported because an effort was made to reach the entire population of individuals who terminated from CETA during the period under study. Those who could not be contacted had unusually high rates of geographic mobility. We therefore cannot claim to have a random sample.

REFERENCES

Althauser, Robert P., and Arne L. Kalleberg

1981 "Firms, occupations, and the structure of labor markets: a conceptual analysis." Pp. 119-149 in Ivar Berg (ed.) Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets. New York: Academic Press.

Becker, Gary S.

1964 Human Capital. New York: Columbia University Press.

Berg, Ivar

1970 Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. New York: Praeger.

Blau, Peter, and Otis Dudley Duncan

1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: Wiley.

Cain, Glen G.

1976 "The challenge of segmented labor market theories to orthodox theory." Journal of Economic Literature 14:1215-1257.

Doeringer, Peter B., and Michael J. Piore

1971 Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

Eckaus, Richard S.

1973 Estimating the Returns to Education: A Disaggregated Approach. Berkeley, Cal.: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Employment and Training Administration (U.S. Department of Labor)

1977 Dictionary of Occupational Titles, 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Featherman, David L., and Robert M. Hauser

1978 Opportunity and Change. New York: Academic Press.

Gordon, David M.

1972 Theories of Poverty and Unemployment. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath

Hauser, Robert M., and David L. Featherman

1977 The Process of Stratification: Trends and Analysis. New York: Academic Press.

Hodge, Robert W.

1981 "The measurement of occupational status." Social Science Research 10:396-415.

Jencks, Christopher

1979 Who Gets Ahead?: The Determinants of Economic Success in America. New York: Basic Books.

Kalleberg, Arne L., and Aage B. Sørensen

1979 "The sociology of labor markets." Annual Review of Sociology 5:351-379.

Kerr, Clark

1954 "The balkanization of labor markets." Pp. 92-110 in E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Gladys L. Palmer, Charles A. Myers, Dale Yoder, and Clark Kerr (eds.), Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity. New York: MIT Press and Wiley.

Leigh, Duane E.

1978 An Analysis of the Determinants of Occupational Upgrading. New York: Academic Press.

Miller, Delbert C., and William H. Form

1980 Industrial Sociology: Work in Organizational Society (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Mincer, Jacob

1974 Schooling, Experience and Earnings. New York: Columbia University Press.

Office of Management and Budget (Executive Office of the President)

1972 Standard Industrial Classification Manual. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Osterman, Paul

1975 "An empirical study of labor market segmentation." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 28:508-523.

Piore, Michael J.

1970 "Jobs and training." Pp. 53-83 in Samuel H. Beer and Richard E. Barringer (eds.), The State and the Poor. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop.

1975 "Notes for a theory of labor market stratification." Pp. 125-150 in Richard C. Edwards, Michael Reich and David M. Gordon (eds.), Labor Market Segmentation. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

Sewell, William H., and Robert M. Hauser

1975 Education, Occupation, and Earnings: Achievement in the Early Career. New York: Academic Press.

Stevens, Gillian, and David L. Featherman

1981 "A revised socioeconomic index of occupational status." Social Science Research 10:364-395.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1971 1970 Census of Population Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

WESTAT

1981 Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey. Follow-Up Report No. 4. Multivariate Analysis: 36-Month Follow-Up of Terminees Who Entered CETA during January-June 1975. Rockville, Md.: WESTAT.

Table 1. Proportions of Periods Before and After CETA in which Respondents Were Unemployed

Category	(N)	Mean Values			Median Values		
		Before CETA	After CETA	Change	Before CETA	After CETA	Change
All Respondents	(485)	.57	.34	-.23	.54	.09	-.45
Primary Program:							
Work Experience (WE)	(55)	.72	.43	-.29	.99	.29	-.70
On-the-Job (OJT)	(104)	.54	.22	-.32	.50	0	-.50
Classroom Training in Occupational Skills (CT)	(101)	.57	.32	-.25	.60	.20	-.40
Public Service Employment (PSE)	(175)	.51	.28	-.23	.47	0	-.47
Employment and Training Services (ETS)	(43)	.66	.65	-.01	.94	.81	-.13

Table 2. Average Weekly Wages

Category	(N)	Mean Values			Median Values		
		Before CETA	After CETA	Change	Before CETA	After CETA	Change
All Respondents	(311)	157.86	168.92	11.06	137.60	144.80	7.20
Primary Program:							
WE	(22)	103.63	170.96	67.33	119.87	135.20	15.33
OJT	(69)	170.29	179.88	9.59	160.10	153.00	-7.10
CT	(68)	155.80	167.87	12.07	130.05	146.12	16.07
PSE	(129)	163.80	167.48	3.68	150.00	144.77	-5.23
ETS	(22)	147.89	147.00	-0.89	124.38	140.00	15.62

Table 3. Average Weekly Wages, with Unemployment Equal to Zero

Category	(N)	Mean Values			Median Values		
		Before CETA	After CETA	Change	Before CETA	After CETA	Change
All Respondents	(569)	102.11	127.83	25.72	101.20	134.00	32.80
Primary Program:							
WE	(62)	50.16	106.23	56.07	0.14	117.45	117.31
OJT	(116)	114.38	142.64	28.26	107.20	139.90	32.70
CT	(117)	101.20	134.44	33.24	98.00	134.03	36.03
PSE	(211)	121.19	137.38	16.19	126.00	136.80	10.80
ETS	(56)	72.84	85.40	12.56	24.00	50.38	26.38

Table 4. Average Socioeconomic Index (SEI) of Employed Respondents

Category	(N)	Mean Values			Median Values		
		Before CETA	After CETA	Change	Before CETA	After CETA	Change
All Respondents	(343)	23.48	23.94	0.46	20.95	20.71	-0.24
Primary Program:							
WE	(24)	20.40	23.14	2.74	19.52	19.74	0.22
OJT	(78)	24.68	23.56	-1.12	21.10	19.60	-1.50
CT	(76)	23.42	24.04	0.62	20.95	21.10	0.15
PSE	(141)	23.67	24.27	0.60	21.10	21.10	0
ETS	(23)	21.86	23.99	2.13	20.43	20.66	0.23

Table 5. Percentages of Employees in the "Core" Industrial Sector

Category	(N)	Before CETA	After CETA	Change
All Respondents	(336)	36.5	45.1	8.6
Primary Program:				
WE	(24)	16.7	37.5	20.8
OJT	(77)	27.3	39.0	11.7
CT	(72)	34.7	26.4	-8.3
PSE	(141)	48.9	63.1	14.2
ETS	(22)	18.2	22.7	4.5

Table 6. Percentages of Private-Sector Employees in the "Core" Industrial Sector

Category	Before CETA (N)	Before CETA Percent	After CETA (N)	After CETA Percent	Percent Change
All Respondents	(293)	33.1	(244)	36.5	3.4
Primary Program:					
WE	(22)	18.2	(18)	44.4	26.2
OJT	(70)	24.3	(71)	39.4	15.1
CT	(62)	33.9	(66)	27.3	-6.6
PSE	(116)	44.0	(67)	46.3	2.3
ETS	(22)	18.2	(21)	19.0	0.8

Figure 1. Summary of Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Wage Levels and SEI Scores of Jobs Before and After CETA

Before CETA

Wage = .09 (father's SEI) -.01 (father's education) + e

R^2 = .01

SEI = .03 (father's SEI) -.01 (father's education)

+ .23 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .05

After CETA

Wage = -.02 (father's SEI) -.05 (father's education)

+ .11 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .01

SEI = .10 (father's SEI) + .07 (father's education)

+ .26 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .11

Figure 2. Summary of Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Wage Levels and SEI Scores for Jobs Before and After CETA (White Males Only)

Before CETA

Wage = .11 (father's SEI) -.02 (father's education)
+ .03 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .01

SEI = -.02 (father's SEI)
+ .27 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .07

After CETA

Wage = -.03 (father's SEI) + .02 (father's education)
+ .14 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .02

SEI = .15 (father's SEI) -.05 (father's education)
+ .27 (respondent's education) + e

R^2 = .10